

Deborah.Easterling

239775
2012-203E

From: jmathews002@sc.rr.com
Sent: Saturday, October 06, 2012 11:20 AM
To: PSC_Contact
Subject: Fwd: Re: Responses to Mr. Mathews
Attachments: Re: Responses to Mr. Mathews

Please forward to the PSC board.

--

Jim Matthews
803 834-3589

PROCESSED
1000
MAIL / DIMS

103000

Deborah.Easterling

From: jmathews002@sc.rr.com
Sent: Saturday, October 06, 2012 11:13 AM
To: JACKSON, KENNETH R
Subject: Re: Responses to Mr. Mathews

Mr. Jackson:

I appreciated you taking time to speak to me about my items of interest. Since this email I have attended the Oct 2nd Public Night Hearing meeting. I was not as aware of what was expected of the Public attendees as I thought I might be. The PSC and your attorneys apparently were expecting the Public attendees to be completely informed as they were of all the matters and procedures that were intended for this hearing.

I only know what I read in the newspaper. There are mountains of information that I am not aware of.

One recent article from the State newspaper on Oct 2nd, mentioned how City of Columbia was not really aware of the possible potential hazards of unexpected spills from the Nuclear reactors until just recently. I had personally attended the DHEC Public comments meeting concerning the water permit for the 2 new reactors and brought up the fact that any water recycled back into the Broad river would be put into much of Columbia's drinking water.

I find, that even without any technical expertise or knowledge, a Nuclear accident resulting in a spill of the water exposed to the radiation, would be virtually impossible to stop all of the toxic water from an unintentional release into the Broad river. Minimumlly, the detection of toxic water would be after the fact. A large part of the toxic water would already have been passed onto the Columbia city water supply. To measure what portion of the water is good, and what part is bad would be impossible. I don't believe, just broadcasting a "boil your water", as done with a sewage spill, would ever be enough to prevent exposure to the toxic water.

I had picked up one of the brochures about the Westinghouse AP1000 pressurized water reactor. I was not able to see, in the brochure, the basic "water-in" and "water-out" indication in the diagrams. The most I read from the brochure about the cooling water source, was where the water originated and was recycled, was of no consequence or concern. I don't think they considered the use of a drinking water supply.

I believe I read that Japan's recent Nuclear reactor disaster was using ocean water for their cooling process. The ocean water, of course, would not find its way back into the public drinking water. This, of course, does not take away from the level of disaster.

Ultimately, regarding the Public that was present at the Public hearing night, continuing with the 2 New Reactors would be outrageously overburdening in costs for all the discovered and yet undiscovered safety additions that will be required to go live. Even after everything has been questionably legally signed off, the continued build up of Nuclear waste will be ongoing infinitum toward more disaster potential.

---- "JACKSON wrote:
> Mr. Matthews:
>

>
>
> It was a pleasure to speak with you this afternoon. SCE&G's latest quarterly report regarding the construction of the two new nuclear units in Jenkinsville may be found at the following link: <http://www.scana.com/NR/rdonlyres/2D35A6A3-0704-4D0C-8A5C-6028C13912EC/0/BLRA2Q2012.pdf>. Below in red are the answers to the questions that you asked.
>
>
>
> Q1. How much, in dollars and cents, have Federal Government loan and or subsidies already been approved for these 2 new nuclear reactors? No Federal Government loans or subsidies have been approved for these two new nuclear reactors.
>
>
>
> Q2. How much, in dollars and cents, of these Federal loans or subsidies has already been used or spent? None. See Answer to Q1.
>
>
>
> Q3. How much, in dollars and cents, of these Federal loans or subsidies has already been paid back? None. See Answers to Q1 and Q2.
>
>
>
> Q4. What is the percentage of completion of the 2 new nuclear sites in Jenkinsville? SCE&G estimates the construction of the two new nuclear units in Jenkinsville is approximately 20-25% complete.
>
>
>
> Q5. What will happen to the already existing Reactor in Jenkinsville? The existing nuclear reactor in Jenkinsville will continue to generate electrical power to serve SCE&G's customers.
>
>
>
> Q6. What will happen if the rate increase request is denied? As we discussed during our telephone conversation, no rate increase has been requested in Docket No. 2012-203-E. In this docket, SCE&G is asking the Commission to approve updated construction schedules and updated capital cost schedules for the construction of the two new nuclear units in Jenkinsville.
>
>
>
> Again, it was a pleasure to speak with you this afternoon. Please let me know if we can be of any further assistance.
>
>
>
> Kenny Jackson
>
> SCE&G
>
> W 217-7805
>

--

Jim Matthews
803 834-3589